



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

permitted, much less commanded, to deprive him of those rights. To expel an individual alien for an individual

condition or individual conduct is a very different thing from excluding alien classes as a political necessity.

The Ultimate Basis of Immigration

By HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, PH.D.¹

New York University

THE two elemental facts in both economics and sociology are that the ultimate source of all wealth is land and the sole means of making this wealth available for the satisfaction of human desires is human labor. The absorbing interest of mankind, accordingly, is and always has been how to make the former factor yield maximum returns with a minimum expenditure of the latter.

All the complicated laws and principles of economics are either elaborations or interpretations of these basic truths, variations upon the great central theme of life.

It follows that the ownership of land is the primary economic desideratum, not only because the ownership of land carries with it the possession of the immediate sources of wealth, but also because it commonly happens that if one owns enough land he can compel someone else to supply the labor necessary for the production of wealth.

The most illuminating conception of immigration is as the modern aspect of man's perennial search for land, for that is what it is in the last analysis. The power back of immigration is one of the most universal and insistent of all social forces—land hunger.

Man began his quest of land long before there was any economics or sociology to explain why he did it, long before he had progressed far enough in in-

telligence to be conscious of what he was doing himself. His early search for land was like that of the lower animals, instinctive, a natural reaction to the urge of hunger and the pressure of competitors. We may think of the primitive movements of population as the slow, gradual, unconscious expansion of the newly differentiated human species over the area suitable for its habitation, an area ever widening as the species developed in resourcefulness and evolved new types to fit diversified habitats.

Fortunately for man, during the first stages of his dispersion over the habitable globe he was not subjected to opposition from other groups of men. From the human point of view, he was moving into uninhabited territory; his only conflicts were with other species of animals and with inanimate Nature. This type of movement continued as long as there were uninhabited regions to be appropriated. This period included so large a majority of the whole span of human existence that the feeling of movement as a remedy for stringency apparently became closely interwoven with the very fibres of human nature until the appetite for land-appropriation—what one writer has naïvely transmuted into “the right to choose a home”—became almost instinctive.

A new epoch in population movements dawned when all the desirable sections of the surface of the earth became inhabited by men, so that the op-

¹ Author of: *Greek Immigration to the United States* (1911), *Immigration* (1913), *Outline of Applied Sociology* (1916).—The EDITOR.

portunity to move into unappropriated land was no longer open. From that time on migration became of necessity aggression upon the territory of another group whose land, whether because of a scantier population or for some other reason, appeared more attractive than that held by the aggressor. Such aggression, however, was always resented by the invaded group, because (however the group itself might have explained it) it was aimed directly at the source of the wealth of the group. Resentment was accompanied by resistance, and thus began that interminable series of wars over land which has continued down to the present moment, and which will not cease until some agency for guaranteeing territorial integrity is established other than the armed force of the groups themselves. The conquests and invasions of the classical times and the Dark Ages were all manifestations of the hostile type of land-quest. The activities commonly described as colonization differ from conquest and invasion primarily in the fact that the groups whose land is seized are so inferior in either numbers or culture that they can offer no effective resistance.

The discovery of the Western Hemisphere and the other great discoveries which marked that epoch opened a distinct era in population movements. The new features were due partly to the enormous extent of the new lands and the small power of resistance of the inhabitants, and partly to other historical factors which need not be reviewed here. The one vital difference between the old and the new forms of movement is that the nationals of a foreign country are allowed free access to modern states, *provided they come as individuals and on their own initiative*. This is the essential feature which sets immigration off as something entirely

different from any previous population movement. At the same time the new movement, although peaceful, is none the less a case of land-quest.

Immigrants from European and Asiatic countries come to the United States, Canada, Argentina, Australia, etc., primarily because the land situation is better in these new countries than it is at home. Whatever other motives of political or religious oppression, or social discrimination may be apparent are secondary, not only because they are of lesser weight but also because they are themselves the result of social conditions which the land situation has created or made possible. The United States is a democratic country primarily not because its early settlers wished to make it so but because it comprises a scanty population on a vast domain of enormous natural resources. The French, during the colonial period, tried to clap down a ready-made aristocratic system in Canada, but found that it would not work. There is evidence, also, that our democracy is waning with the increase in the density of our population.

From our point of view, then, immigration is a peaceful and permitted aggression of foreigners upon the territory of the United States. The fact that most of the recent immigrants do not themselves become landowners, or even work directly upon the land, does not alter the truth of that statement. At one, two, or more removes from the land they are sharing the benefits of our unique land situation, and that is why they come. This may seem a harsh way of stating the case, but it is no more harsh than is the operation of most natural laws. One reason why we have tolerated this peaceful aggression so good-naturedly in the past is that our man-land ratio was in fact so low that the newcomers were an actual advantage. One reason

why the restrictionist sentiment has grown so rapidly in recent years is that population has become so congested that the advantages of foreign accessions are at the best doubtful.

The practical questions of immigration, from the regulative point of view, are two. First, has the development of the United States reached the point where foreign increments are actually of no benefit to the country at large, socially or economically? Second, assuming that we as a nation reap no net advantage from immigration, are there other considerations which should induce us to permit its continuance? Are we bound by any obligations of international justice or humanitarian ethics to maintain the policy of admitting unlimited numbers of foreigners after we have reached the point in our national development where the coming of these foreigners tends in the direction of an unfavorable man-land ratio?

It is not the province of this paper to seek to answer these questions, but to point out the fundamental considerations which must be taken into account in formulating the answer.

A favorable man-land ratio lies at the basis of democratic institutions, of a high standard of living, of a progressive economic civilization, and in fact of practically all the elements of an enviable national situation. It is therefore the most valuable heritage of a nation. And since a favorable man-land ratio, once lost, can be recovered only with the greatest difficulty if at all, a nation is justified in regarding infringements on such a ratio as direct attacks upon its welfare not only for the present but also for the future.

Every nation with an unfavorable man-land ratio, and the individual members of such a nation, look with envious eyes upon other nations which are more fortunately situated, and are

urged by the most natural of impulses to seek to share in their advantages in all possible ways. The most direct way is to transfer the surplus population from the more crowded to the less crowded country. In the manner of colonization this transfer is made by the authority of the state, and the natives of the country of destination are so powerless that their convenience is not consulted. In the case of immigration the transfer is made by the initiative and on the resources of the individual migrants, and the consent of the receiving nation is a necessity. There is little question on the part of students of sociology or political science that it is well within the scope of the inherent rights of the receiving nation to limit this consent in any way or to refuse it altogether.

There is not the slightest ground for assuming that the natural urge to migrate to the United States will cease as long our man-land ratio and the social, political and economic conditions which arise out of it are sufficiently superior to those of the most crowded and most backward country in the world so as to promise any advantage to the people of that country as a reward for migration. The same principle applies to all countries in general. The natural culmination of unrestricted immigration would come only when the man-land ratio of all countries had been reduced to a common level, and that level would be the equivalent of that which prevailed in the most poorly situated country.

The problem at the present time presents two aspects from the point of view of the United States. The first concerns immigration from European countries, the second, that from Oriental lands. Before the war the process of equalizing advantages between the countries of Europe and America had progressed so far that there was no

longer a strong incentive for the common people of the more favored European countries to migrate, and immigration from England, Ireland, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, etc., had fallen to small proportions. The immigration from the less fortunate countries of the south and southeast, on the other hand, was large and increasing. What the effects of the war will be it is as yet too early to determine with certainty. There is much evidence that a European immigration exceeding the maximum prewar figures is impending. If this is true, it means that although the war reduced the population of European nations, it also destroyed capital and organization to such an extent as to have actually made the man-land ratio less favorable.

With reference to Oriental immigration the acute problem is now concerned with the Japanese. There is no question that the restlessness of the

Japanese nation is due at bottom to the congestion of a prolific people upon a land of limited productive area. This is generally recognized, and it is frequently asserted that such a nation must have an outlet—"not the United States, of course, but Manchuria, Korea, or Siberia."

Such a statement brings up the crux of the whole immigration problem, not only with reference to the Japanese but also with reference to all other peoples. It may be briefly stated thus: Has a nation whose population is expanding beyond its own resources to such an extent as to threaten its standard of living a right to look for an outlet in some other land? Or has the time come to deny the right of a nation which is suffering stringency because of an unrestrained growth of population to seek relief by encroaching on the territory of a more fortunate or more self-controlled country?

Immigration and the Future

By FRANCES KELLOR¹
New York City

AMONG the news columns of today one finds items like the following: "Twenty-five million people trying to come to America," "Congress asked to suspend immigration for two years," "Italian syndicate organized to promote immigration and to assist

¹ Miss Kellor is the organizer and Vice-Chairman of The Inter-racial Council; the Chairman of the Board of the American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, which she reorganized and put under American control. She was Chief of the New York State Bureau of Industries and Immigration before the war, and in charge of the War Work Extension of the Board of Education of the Department of the Interior. She is the author of *Out of Work, Straight America* and *Immigration and the Future*. She has recently returned from a study of conditions in Europe.—The EDITOR.

Italian immigrants in their enterprises in other countries; special schools organized to teach such emigrants to read and write and to trade, so the investments of the syndicate may yield a big return . . ."; "European radical labor chiefs plan to invade America . . ."; "Overseas corporation organized to bring in the families in Europe of immigrants in America at \$300 per family . . ."; "Riot in America between the Venzelosists and royalists over the Greek election . . ."; "Russian trial, in the style of modern justice in Revolutionary Russia, took place last week in New York when a comrade was tried for misappropriating relief funds